UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,256	04/20/2001	Lalitha Suryanarayana	T00336	1539

7590 09/15/2004

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, IL 60610

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, TRONG NHAN P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2152	

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/839,256	SURYANARAYANA, LALITHA	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jack P Nguyen	2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/20/01 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-21 are being examined.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The Specification fails to include Summary of Invention. See MPEP Section 608.01d, 37 CFR 1.73. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jawahar et al, 6,289,333 (Jawahar hereafter) in view of Huang al, 6,477,543 (Huang hereafter).

5. As per claim 1, Jawahar teaches a method for synchronizing World Wide Web (108, fig. 1) content between a plurality of devices (20, 22, fig. 1) in a network that comprises initiating a synchronized session between the plurality of devices; a first device of the plurality of devices retrieving content from a World Wide Web server; and synchronizing the content among the plurality of mobile devices such that the content on each of the mobile devices is substantially similar [(col. 11, lines 51-58 *(initializing and retrieving content from web server by a device)*; col. 12, lines 37-44 *(synchronization is established between the devices via the control server)*]; Jawahar does not explicitly disclose mobile devices connecting thru plurality of proxies. However, Huang shows a system where a plurality of mobile devices (101, 102, fig. 1; col. 7, lines 27-30) are connected thru a plurality of proxies (105, 106, fig. 1; col. 7, lines 47-49) for accessing data. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Jawahar and Huang because by using mobile devices, the users can connect to a synchronized session with other users at any location while he is traveling or where a wire-based device is not available.

6. Claim 2 is rejected for same reasons as claim 1.

7. As per claim 3, Jawahar teaches the method of claim 1 and further including the step of initiating a voice call between at least two of the plurality of devices (C12, L28-31).

8. As per claim 4, Jawahar teaches the method of claim 3 and further including the steps of: terminating the synchronization session; and continuing the voice call (C12, L45-56; *users can choose different modes of data exchanges with each other that could include text or voice or both, if desired. Therefore, users can choose to terminate either mode of communication at any time, when desired, without interrupting the other mode of communication as disclosed herein.*)

9. As per claims 5-6, Jawahar shows a control server (64, fig. 2; now designated as second proxy) that can be used as a Push Proxy Gateway (PPG). Jawahar does not show a proxy push initiator. However, Huang shows a proxy (105, fig. 1; now designated as first proxy) that can be used as WAP Proxy push initiator (PPI). It is well known in the art to use proxies to allow mobile devices to communicate with each other.

10. Claims 7-9, 11-14, 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Jawahar.

11. As per claim 7, Huang teaches mobile devices (101, 102, fig. 1; col. 7, lines 27-30) in a wireless communication network connecting thru a plurality of proxies (106, 107) establishing a synchronized Web content over the Internet. The mobile device initiates the synchronization request thru a sync proxy. After the sync proxy authenticates the user and device profiles of the request, the sync proxy then authorizes the mobile device to access the desired content and applications. The sync proxy also

establishes a connection between the mobile devices and their hosts to start exchanging data (col. 9, lines 55-60; col. 9, lines 64 – col. 10, lines 4; col. 10, lines 11-17; col. 10, lines 37-42; col. 11, lines 4-8). Huang does not explicitly disclose the second mobile device sending a synchronization signal to the WAP proxy and the WAP proxy sending a signal to the first mobile device. However, Jawahar teaches the second device acknowledging and sending the accept signal to the control server (equivalent in function as PPG) in establishing the synchronized session between the two devices. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Huang and Jawahar because by establishing a synchronized session between mobile devices will allow the users the flexibility to exchange synchronized data with each other when they are physically unable to attend the meeting while traveling or not having access to a wired computing device.

12. As per claim 13, the limitations of the claim do not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 7. The sync proxy in claim 13 performs the function of the WAP proxy in claim 7 while the WAP proxy in claim 13, as part of the preamble, does not further define or convey additional limitations in the body of the claim and is therefore, given no patentable weight. Therefore, claim 13 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 7.

13. As per claim 16, the limitations are similar to claim 7 with the additional limitations of having device profiles. However, the rejection in claim 7 has taken device

profiles into account from the teaching of Huang as cited above. Claim 16, therefore, is rejected for the similar reasons as claim 7.

14. As per claim 20, the limitations are similar to claim 7 with additional limitations of the first mobile device requesting web content from web server via the WAP proxy. After receiving the web content from the web server, the proxy sends the content to the first wireless device. It also sends a signal to the second device as well. When the second device sends the request, the proxy then sends the content to the second device. Huang teaches the synchronization process between the mobile devices through the proxy servers as cited in claim 7 rejection. Huang does not explicitly teach after synchronization, the first and second device send and receive content data from a web server via the proxy. However, Pawahar teaches a synchronization process between a plurality of devices through the control server (functionally equivalent to PPG as noted above). Upon requesting content from a web server, the control server sends the content data to all the devices that are in the synchronized session as cited in claim 1 rejection. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Huang and Jawahar because by allowing a synchronized session between users (including mobile users), any user can make requests for content while all the users can view the same data in the session. This feature is extremely convenient and beneficial for users who are traveling or are unable to attend the meeting at a particular location or do not have access to a wired

computing device so they can participate in the synchronized session from any location using mobile devices.

15. As per claim 8, Huang teaches the Wireless Access Protocol Proxy is a Push Initiator (105, fig. 1). It is well known in the art to use a Push Initiator in a wireless network.

16. As per claim 9, it is well known in the art to use a PPG (106, fig. 1) to communicate with mobile devices.

17. Claims 11, 14, 17 and 20 are rejected on the same basis as claim 3.

18. Claim 12 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 7.

19. As per claim 18, the limitations are similar to claim 20 with the additional limitations of converting data received from the web server into formats that are compatible with the mobile devices. Huang teaches a the system where the mobile devices send the device profiles along with the sync requests to the sync proxy as noted in claims 7 and 16 above. The sync proxy then converts the data into formats that are compatible and displayable by the mobile device as disclosed in col. 8, lines 25-33. Therefore, claim 18 is rejected for similar reasons as claims 16 and 20.

20. Claim 19 is rejected for similar reasons as claim 18.

21. Claims 10 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in views of Jawahar, WAP Wireless Communication, 5/11/99, pages 1-5 (WWC hereafter), and Anumpam et al, 6,360,250 (Anupam hereafter),

22. As per claim 10, Huang teaches a synchronization session between a plurality of mobile devices via a plurality of proxies. Huang does not disclose the steps of retrieving web content as claimed. WCC discloses WAP stack that includes the Get, Push, etc commands that are used in a wireless communication network (page 5). However, Anumpam teaches a method of retrieving web content data by a plurality of computing devices in a data sharing/collaborating session by performing the disclosed steps. The collaborative session between the devices are managed by the controller (103, fig. 1). Once a new user joins in the session, the controller provides the new user the sequence of URLs that has been accessed by the other clients on the session. When a client submits a new URL to retrieve a particular document on the web, the controller sends the URL to all the clients in the session informing them of the new URL. Then all the clients will direct their browsers to open the HTML document at the new URL. The collaborators manage to synchronously move from one URL to another to browse the documents as the session progresses (col. 4, lines 65 – col. 5, lines 17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Huang and WCC because by allowing a synchronized session between users (including mobile

can make requests for content while all the users can view the same data in the session. This feature is extremely convenient and beneficial for users who are traveling or are unable to attend the meeting or do not have access to a wired computing device. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to show an alternative teaching of Anupam by allowing the users to retrieve the same documents from the web content server by sending them URL updates as one user initiates a new URL request for a particular content.

23. Claim 15 is a variation of claim 10 with the additional limitations that include the device profiles and data received from the web server is tailored to be compatible with the devices. Therefore, claim 15 is rejected for the similar reasons as claims 10 and 18.

Conclusion

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Wireless Communication Network Having Voice and Data Capability – Angle et al, 6,366,771
- System and Method For Application Viewing Through Collaborative Web Browsing System – Rust, 6,668,273
- Device Aware Internet Portal – Jiang et al, 6,741,853
- Call Center System Where Users and Representatives Conduct Simultaneous Voice and Joint Browsing Session – Roberts et al, 6,295,551

- Method, Apparatus, and Program Storage Device For a Client and Adaptive Synchronization and Transformation Server – Huang et al, 6,477,543
- Conference System Having an Embedded Web Server, and Method Of Use Thereof – Vanderwilt et al, 6,693,661
- Apparatus and Method For Sharing Information in Simultaneously Viewed Documents on a Communication System – Anupam et al, 6,360,250
- Interactive Conference Content Distribution Device and Methods of Use Thereof – Dunlap et al, 6,760,749
- Intelligent Harvesting and Navigation System and Method – Jamtgaard et al, 6,430,624
- System For Dynamic Determination of Client Communications Capabilities – Bakshi et al, 6,311,215
- System For Dynamically Transcoding Data Transmitted Between Computers – Tso et al, 6,421,733
- System and Method For Providing a Synchronized Display To a Plurality of Computers Over a Global Computer Network – Craig, 6,108,687
- System and Method For Managing Interactions Between Users In a Browser Based Telecommunications Network – England, 6,144,991

25. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jack P Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 605-4299. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenn Burgess can be reached on (703) 305-4792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jpn

Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner